

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1-21 have been cancelled.

New Claims 22-25 have been added.

I. **SPECIFICATION**

Applicants have updated the related application serial nos. as requested by the Examiner.

II. **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 11-15 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). Since these claims have been cancelled, these objections are moot.

III. **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Since these claims have been cancelled, these rejections are moot.

IV. **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Freed et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,473). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Claims 1-21 have been cancelled, and replaced by claims 22-25.

The *Freed* patent specifically teaches designing and developing highly configurable software systems. Column 1, lines 21-22. Though *Freed* discusses enterprise software, *Freed* does not in any way teach or suggest the determination of a solution scope for the technical framework to be created, wherein this technical framework is for use and delivering a specific set of information technology services for a customer. Nor does *Freed* teach or suggest that such a solution scope is guided by an information technology services contract with such customer. Neither does *Freed* teach or suggest that the solution scope is based on common practices for delivering certain types of information technology services.

Likewise, *Freed* does not teach or suggest mapping the customer's existing equipment to lowest level abstractions of architectural building blocks in a technical model. Nor does *Freed* teach or suggest that such a technical model described people, processes, tools and information used to deliver specific services to customers. Again, *Freed* is only concerned with the programming of software. Nor does *Freed* teach or suggest that the architectural building blocks comprise components that are sufficiently modular and bounded to be described as self-contained entities.

Further, *Freed* does not teach or suggest creating a list of design objects as a function of the solution scope, wherein the design objects are based on logical groupings of the architectural building blocks, which include software and hardware components.

The present invention goes beyond what is taught or suggested in *Freed* by looking at an overall enterprise system, not just enterprise software. Such an enterprise system includes the people, processes, software and hardware used to solve a customer's information technology services problem as described in a services contract with such a customer.

Unless the Examiner can find each and every one of these elements within the *Freed* reference, the Examiner cannot prove a *prima facie* case of anticipation of the claims.

V. CONCLUSION


As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an early allowance of such Claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

By:   
Kelly K. Korczak  
Reg. No. 36,571

P.O. Box 50784  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(512) 370-2851